

February 15, 1996 LB 676, 1050, 1337

are moving into that more cost-effective tier, you actually get in a cash payment. Before you do that though you have to present a plan that has some efficiency steps and other things in it to present that is approved by the state reorganization committee. And then you, so you essentially have three years to qualify, to qualify for the incentives, but with the plan it would be a five-year period. So there's a limited amount of time, actually, that this could cost the equalization fund, and that was a point last year that was controversial. However, it is a very minimal amount, about \$3 million that would be there and I think that it's just one more incentive to those school districts that are looking to make that move. Last year we accomplished removing the disincentives. This really was part B and part C to that that we didn't get done last year. And I hope that it will have favorable consideration by the body. And on that I'll close on my portion and I think Senator Wickersham probably has his light on to explain his.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Withem would move to amend this component of the committee amendments.

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, just very quickly I'm going to comment on an amendment that I plan, I plan on withdrawing this amendment and after people, after people understand it a little better, offering it on Select File. Last year, as LB 676 was coming to the floor, I had very serious reservations about it because it was taking money out of the equalization fund. Now that we are in the process of correcting some of those what I see problems with equalization, I don't have nearly those concerns about it. The only other provision that I'm going to have is if we're going to "incent" for reorganization I think there are some things within the reorganization process that probably need to be dealt with a little differently. I had a bill, LB 1337, heard in front of the Education Committee the other day. Talked to some of the members of the committee, I don't know if...so far I've not detected any membership opposition to it. I'm not going to ask you to make a decision on that today. I'm going to withdraw this amendment, have it printed in the Journal, but it will be, you know, part of my rationale for being able to support taking some money out of equalization to reorganize